



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/554,343 12/06/00 SAATHOFF

K HHI-023US

EXAMINER

QM32/0810

ANTHONY A LAURETANO
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD
28 STATE STREET
BOSTON MA 02109

MEISLIN, D.

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3723

DATE MAILED:

08/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/554,343		SAATHOFF ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Debra S. Meislin		3723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>6</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3723

1. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The structure and operation of the motor driven manual wrench has not been clearly set forth in view of the specification and drawings. Specifically, the structure of the articulated joint "8", the articulated body "9", the adapter "12", the spring "10", the motor, the torque limiter, the structure of the motorized portion of the device, the cooperation between the manual and motorized portions of the device, and the operation of the each of the above listed elements has not been clearly defined to enable an understanding of the invention.

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of 37 CFR 1.71(a)-(c):

(a) The specification must include a written description of the invention or discovery and of the manner and process of making and using the same, and is required to be in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art or science to which the invention or discovery appertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same.

(b) The specification must set forth the precise invention for which a patent is solicited, in such manner as to distinguish it from other inventions and from what is old. It must describe completely a specific embodiment of the process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter or improvement invented, and must explain the mode of operation or principle whenever applicable. The best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention must be set forth.

(c) In the case of an improvement, the specification must particularly point out the part or parts of the process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter to which the improvement relates, and the description should be confined to the specific improvement and to such parts as necessarily cooperate with it or as may be necessary to a complete understanding or description of it.

Art Unit: 3723

The specification is objected to under 37 CFR 1.71. On page 9, lines 21-24 and 35-36 are not understood. On page 10, lines 4-7 and 20-21 are not understood. The specification lacks reference numeral "11" as set forth in the drawings.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, "motor-driven manual wrench" appears contradictory. In line 2, "the driving tool" lacks antecedent basis. In lines 2-3, the alternative phraseology is vague and indefinite since the scope cannot be determined. In lines 4-5, it is not clear as to how the torque limiter is attached to the ratchet drive and to the drive motor in view of the specification and drawings. In line 5, "the manual wrench" should be --motor-driven manual wrench-- since the manual wrench was not separately claimed.

In claims 2-18, line 1, "Manual wrench" should be --motor-driven manual wrench-- since the manual wrench was not separately claimed. Line 2 is misdescriptive since the head cannot be mounted on the wrench since the wrench includes the head as set forth in claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 7-12, 14-16 are not clearly supported (structurally and operationally) by the specification and drawings.

In claims 3 and 4, "the drive shaft" lacks antecedent basis.

Lines 3-7 of claim 6 are not understood in view of the specification and drawings.

In claim 10, lines 3, the alternative phraseology is vague and indefinite since the scope cannot be determined.

Art Unit: 3723

In claim 11, "the electronic circuit" and "the displays" lack antecedent basis.

In claim 14, "a flat" output element is not understood.

4. The specification and drawings appear to be fatally defective. It is suggested that applicant submit a continuation-in-part application which includes a clear understanding of the invention.

5. Normally a claim which fails to comply with the first and/or second paragraph of 35 USC 112, will not be analyzed as to whether it is patentable over the prior art since to do so would of necessity require speculation with regard to the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter, *In re Steele*, 308 F.2d 859, 862-63, 134 USPQ 292, (CCPA 1962) and *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 496 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Meislin at (703) 308-3671.



D. S. Meislin
Primary Examiner
Group 3720, Art Unit 3723

August 8, 2001